

REMARKS

Claims 1-8 are all the claims pending in the application, including new claims 7 and 8 added by the present Amendment.

In reply to the Response filed March 5, 2003 and the Supplemental Response filed April 3, 2003, the Examiner removed all of the previous claim rejections. The status of the claims is as follows.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by newly-cited Brederveld et al. (US 5,898,679). Claims 2 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brederveld et al. in view of newly-cited Hulyalkar et al. (US 5,787,080). Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brederveld et al. and Hulyalkar et al. in view of newly-cited Johnston (US 6,064,649). Claims 4 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brederveld et al. and Hulyalkar et al. in view of newly-cited Patel (US 5,953,706).

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections with the following comments.

Brederveld et al. relates to systems and methods for selectively repeating messages in a wireless computer network. Brederveld et al. provides, for use in a wireless computer network having a radio relay capable of transmitting messages, a system and method, operable with the radio relay, for selectively repeating a unicast message received from a source end-station only upon some indication that a destination end-station has not received the message. The system includes: (1) a transceiver that receives the unicast message from the source end-station and (2) control circuitry, coupled to the transceiver, that determines whether the destination end-station has received the unicast message and causes the transceiver to refrain from repeating the unicast

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. Application No. 09/476,372

message if the destination end-station has received the unicast message, the radio relay thereby freed from repeating already-received unicast messages.

Hulyalkar et al. relates to a method and apparatus for implementing a reservation-based wireless asynchronous transfer mode local area network. A method for implementing a reservation-based wireless asynchronous transfer mode (ATM) local area network (LAN) according to Hulyalkar et al. includes the steps of: a) providing a system architecture of mobile nodes (MNs), each MN for communicating with various ones of the other MNs; b) supporting a plurality of services, each service having respective quality-of-service (QoS) requirements; and c) implementing a medium access control (MAC) layer using a reservation-based communications protocol.

Johnston relates to a network interface card (NIC) for wireless communications and networking over an Asynchronous Transfer Mode (ATM) network and which provides high throughput for hosts of the network.

Patel relates to a data communications system for coordinating reservation data and other information for ground transportation services.

Regarding claim 1, Applicant submits that Brederveld et al. do not teach or suggest all of the limitations of the claim. Specifically, Brederveld et al. do not disclose sending an error occurrence message and allocating a wireless resource for retransmission of data to a wireless terminal simultaneously when an access point detects a data error in data received from the wireless terminal. The Examiner asserts that col. 5, lines 41-44 and col. 8, lines 1-6 of the reference disclose this feature of the claim, but Applicant disagrees. Neither of the cited portions of the reference describe sending an error occurrence message. Instead, col. 5, lines 41-44,

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. Application No. 09/476,372

describes repeating of message traffic. Col. 8, lines 1-6, discloses that if a message contains an error, a relay suppresses a Station BLEEP (S-BLEEP) signal and ignores the message. Thus, rather than sending an error occurrence message when the access point detects an error, Brederveld et al. disclose suppressing the transmission of a signal if a message contains an error.

Furthermore, Brederveld et al. fail to disclose allocating a wireless resource for retransmission of data to the wireless terminal. Col. 5, lines 41-44, discloses retransmitting message traffic, but the reference does not disclose allocating a wireless resource for retransmission of data.

Moreover, Brederveld et al. do not disclose sending an error occurrence message and allocating a wireless resource for retransmission of data to a wireless terminal simultaneously when an access point detects a data error in data received from the wireless terminal. Therefore, claim 1 is not anticipated by Brederveld et al., for at least these reasons.

With respect to claims 2 and 5, these claims are allowable over the prior art, at least because of their dependence from claim 1 and because Hulyalkar et al. fail to make up for the above-noted deficiencies of Brederveld et al.

Furthermore, neither of the references disclose that the error occurrence message is sent to the corresponding wireless terminal while the wireless resource for retransmission is allocated to the corresponding wireless terminal during a down-link period. The Examiner asserts that Brederveld et al. (col. 8, lines 1-6) disclose this feature of claim 2, but Applicant disagrees. The cited excerpt is silent regarding whether the sending of the error occurrence message and the allocating of the wireless resource is during a down-link period. Hence, claim 2 is allowable for this additional reason.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. Application No. 09/476,372

For claim 3, Applicant submits that claim 3 is allowable over the prior art, at least because of its dependence from claim 1, and because Johnston fails to make up for the deficiencies of Brederveld et al. and Hulyalkar et al.

Regarding claims 4 and 6, Applicant submits that claims 4 and 6 are allowable over the prior art, at least because Patel fails to make up for the above-noted deficiencies of Brederveld et al. and Hulyalkar et al., and because of the dependence of claims 4 and 6 from claim 1.

Also, Patel does not disclose all of the limitations of claim 6. The Examiner asserts that Patel (col. 6, lines 35-51) teaches a wireless resource-allocation method wherein an acknowledge information or a not acknowledge information of the wireless terminal is transmitted to the access point during the upload reservation period of a previous frame. However, the cited excerpt only generally discloses that the TN system 1 of Patel acknowledges uploaded reservations information and issues a transportation network ID number to the particular reservation. Such a general disclosure falls short of the specific limitations of claim 6. Furthermore, Patel fails to disclose the remaining limitations of claim 6, which were not even asserted by the Examiner to be disclosed. Therefore, claim 6 is allowable over the prior art for this additional reason.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. Application No. 09/476,372

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Cameron W. Beddard
Registration No. 46,545

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: October 16, 2003